DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 511 CG 011 945

AUTHOR Gutek, Barbara A.
TITLE Impact of the Bureaucratic Encounter on the Client: Some Expected and Unexpected Consequences.
PUB DATE Mar 76
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Sociological Society (St. Louis, Missouri, April, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agencies; *Attitudes; *Bureaucracy; *Community Agencies (Public); Government (Administrative Body); *Public Relations; *Social Agencies; State Agencies; Welfare Agencies; Welfare Services

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses a number of studies undertaken at the Institute for Social Research (Ann Arbor, Michigan) which indicate that the impact of encounter tends to produce a satisfied clientele. Despite this, government agencies suffer from poor image, being described as cold, inefficient, slow and impersonal. Since this seems contradictory, data from a national sample survey of 1, 431 adult Americans by the Survey Research Center in 1973 are presented. The subjects were questioned on the specifics of their contacts with one of seven government service bureaucracies, as well as on the question of support for the political system. The analysis techniques involved the examination of bivariate relationships. In general, clients indicated fairly low levels of support for government agencies, particularly when compared to private companies. Clients who received assistance from government agencies were not more supportive of the government than were non-clients. Generally speaking, if the client's experience with the agency was negative it tended to give him an unfavorable view of all government agencies. (PFS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED146511

IMPACT OF THE BUREAUCRATIC ENCOUNTER ON THE CLIENT: SOME EXPECTED AND UNEXPECTED CONSEQUENCES[1]

Barbara A. Gutek
Institute for Social Research
The University of Michigan

March, 1976

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Barbara A. Gutek

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CG011945

Paper presented at the Midwest Sociological Society Meeting, St. Louis, Missouri, April, 1976.

[1]Data for this article were collected as a part of a larger study on people's reactions to experiences with government agencies at the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, principal investigators. The author especially wishes to thank Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, whose ideas influenced this paper, and the following people for reviewing an earlier draft of the paper: Mark Fichman, Robert L. Kahn, Michael Moch, Dennis N. T. Perkins, and Jeffrey T. Walsh.

IMPACT OF THE BUREAUCRATIC ENCOUNTER ON THE CLIENT: SOME EXPECTED AND UNEXPECTED CONSEQUENCES

Barbara A. Gutek

One common approach to the evaluation of government services is to examine the reactions of the client (Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein, 1971). The scope of such evaluation research is often limited to the immediate impact of the encounter on the client and the focus of the study is generally on agency effectiveness. The client's evaluation of aspects of the agency is of major importance. The relevant variables are the various facets which comprise the satisfaction level of the client. Did clients receive the service for which they applied? Was the agency efficient? Was the agency representative courteous and interested? Did the client have to wait long? Was there ample parking space or adequate public transportation to the agency office? If the client is satisfied with these and similar aspects of the service, the organization is considered to be functioning effectively.

One such study using the reactions of clients as feedback on the effectiveness of organizational functioning was recently completed at the Institute for Social Research (Moch, 1975). A study of Social Security clients encompassed two different populations, a personal contact group and telephone contact sample. The major dependent variables were satisfaction with treatment and satisfaction with outcome. In the study of 116 clients who had personally contacted Social Security offices, 72 percent of respondents said they were satisfied with the outcome of their last visit to the agency and a full 93 percent (including 46 percent who were very satisfied) said they were satisfied with the way they were treated during their last visit.

Almost half of the respondents had contacted Social Security by phone or in writing prior to the interview. Eighty-seven percent of those with prior contacts were satisfied with the way they had been treated during these contacts and 80 percent were satisfied with the outcome of these mail or phone contacts.

Besides examining face-to-face contacts, the study examined phone contacts with those Social Security offices which have a teleservice center. Generally located in metropolitan areas, the teleservice centers handle all incoming calls from a large region. A client is thus unable to reach his local representative, but instead talks to a teleservice representative who answers the majority of questions that the client may ask. A similar level of satisfaction was found for the 131 teleservice center contacts--25 percent were very satisfied with the outcome of their most recent call and another 42 percent were satisfied, leaving 27 percent who were not satisfied with the outcome of their encounters with the teleservice center, as compared to 26 percent in the personal contact sample. Ninety-one percent, compared to 93 percent in the personal contact survey, were satisfied with the treatment they received. This study of social security recipients indicates a relatively satisfied clientele, suggesting that the agency is functioning in a satisfactory manner.

One interesting finding of the study is the fact that clients are even more satisfied with the treatment they receive at the agency than they are with the outcome of the contact. This result contradicts the stereotype of the unconcerned, impersonal, cold bureaucrat. The overall high level of satisfaction with outcome, although lower than satisfaction with treatment seems to contradict the stereotype of the slow, unresponsive bureaucracy.

Two recent studies conducted at the Institute for Social Research (Campbell, Converse and Rodgers, 1976; Withey and Andrews, in press), however, suggest that negative stereotypes of government still exist. Other studies at the Institute by Arthur Miller and his colleagues (1972, 1973) document declining levels of political efficacy and interpersonal trust. And certainly the news media in this post-Watergate era express few sentiments which are favorable to government bureaucracy.

These data suggest the possible existence of contradictory sets of findings, namely high levels of satisfaction with specific encounters with government bureaucracy and low ratings of government bureaucracy in general.

Two separate lines of study reveal these contradictions. Studies which assess client satisfaction with agency contact are frequently concerned with organizational functioning while studies which assess public sentiment toward government bureaucracy are frequently concerned with political system functioning, are rarely limited to, or specify, client groups, and are not conducted within an organizational setting.

Studies which address both of these questions--level of satisfaction with own experience with government bureaucracy and level of satisfaction with government bureaucracy in general--are rare. There are, however, a number of interesting questions which might be pursued relating evaluation of own experience with public bureaucracy to evaluation of public bureaucracy in general. What effect does using a government service agency have on one's attitude toward a government bureaucracy? If a satisfied client is one consequence of many bureaucratic encounters, should one expect that a favorable attitude toward government bureaucracy is another consequence? Can negative stereotypes of

government bureaucracy be broken down by trying to increase satisfaction level among clients of human service bureaucracies?

This paper reports some results from a national sample survey of people's reactions to government in general and to specific encounters with a variety of government agencies (Katz, Gutek, Kahn and Barton, 1975). More specifically, attention is directed toward three questions:

1) Do clients report high levels of satisfaction with a variety of aspects of service from different government agencies?
2) Do the attitudes of adult Americans generally reflect negative stereotypes of government service bureaucracies?
3) What is the relationship between level of satisfaction with own experience with government bureaucracy and level of satisfaction with government bureaucracy in general, and how can that relationship (or its absence) be explained?

THE STUDY

Data come from a national sample of 1431 adult Americans (age 18 or over) living in households in coterminous United States. Personal interviews of approximately one hour in length were administered in the respondent's home by a member of the Survey Research Center's interviewing staff. In general, the sample compares favorably with data collected in the 1970 census, with the single exception of sex. Males account for about 47 percent of the population nationally, but for only 43 percent of the present sample.

The interview schedule contained questions about people's contacts with

seven government service agencies. The service areas are employment service, job training, worker's compensation, unemployment compensation, public assistance, hospital/medical care, and retirement benefits. Questions were asked about several types of problems that respondents experienced, their utilization of relevant government agencies and their satisfaction with the service-seeking experience. In addition to questions about the particular encounters, a number of more general questions were asked about the respondents' attitudes toward government agencies, their level of interpersonal trust, confidence in national leadership, and other related issues.

RESULTS

It was suggested above that 1) clients of government service bureaucracies report relatively high levels of satisfaction with their encounters with those agencies, and 2) Americans as a whole have relatively unfavorable attitudes toward government bureaucracy in general. Data from the 1973 bureaucratic encounters study support both of these assertions. It should be noted that the data are retrospective, that is, respondents were asked about their past experiences with seven government service agencies. While the majority of clients reported experiences within the last five years, some contacts were reported which had occurred 30 years or more in the past. Since the encounters occurred in the past, it is unrealistic to expect that clients will be able to make clear differentiations among aspects of the encounter (e.g., fairness of treatment, satisfaction with outcome, effort expended by agency representative) as would be the case if the client were interviewed immediately after an encounter with an agency. The data support the contention that clients are not able to make clear distinctions among aspects of the encounter. Table 1 shows that the correlations

Table 1 about here

among properties of the episode are relatively high. The strongest correlations are between satisfaction and the other variables. One explanation for the high correlations is the possibility that aspects of the encounter are highly correlated. Another explanation is that, in the case of retrospective data, clients are not able to differentiate aspects of the encounter. Rather, they have a global impression of the episode which is best expressed by their level of satisfaction. In either case, the strong relationships among the various measures of satisfaction make them somewhat substitutable for each other.

Satisfaction with Specific Experiences

Table 2 shows satisfaction rates for the seven service areas. In general, clients show relatively high levels of satisfaction. There are, however, substantial differences among agencies. Retirement agencies showed the highest levels of satisfaction. The lowest levels of satisfaction were expressed by recipients of public assistance and hospital and medical care agencies. Compared to recipients of retirement benefits, about 30 percent fewer recipients of these two agencies reported satisfactory encounters. Overall, 13 percent of respondents were very dissatisfied with their contacts with government service agencies.

Tables 2 & 3 about here

Table 3 reports perceived fairness of treatment of clients of the same seven service agencies. Bureaucracies in which decisions are made according to rules and regulations show a fairness of treatment across clients. All individuals

are processed according to the rules of the organization rather than by decisions of individual organizational members, thereby eliminating the effects of individual bias and prejudice (Gerth and Mills, 1946). About 80 percent of respondents felt that they were, in fact, treated fairly by government service agencies, although once again there is substantial variation by type of problem. Social security, worker's compensation and job training programs are perceived as being most fair in their treatment of clients.

Together, Tables 2 and 3 suggest that individuals are quite satisfied with their treatment by government service agencies, and these data agree with the results of Moch's (1975) study of Social Security claimants.

Satisfaction with Public Bureaucracy in General

The second assertion made earlier was that ratings of government bureaucracies in the abstract are generally low, and that they reflect the prevailing stereotype of government as inefficient, inconsiderate, slow, and unconcerned about people. Table 4 shows the ratings given government offices in the abstract. The questions were worded in the following format: "We want to know how good or bad you think government offices are on the following things . . . . First let's take prompt service. How good or how bad do you think most government offices are in giving prompt service?" Besides promptness of service, respondents were also asked about the following characteristics of government offices: really taking care of the problem, giving considerate treatment to people, giving fair treatment, avoiding mistakes, and correcting mistakes. Some 10 percent of the respondents gave government offices high marks on prompt service and 18 percent low ratings, with the great majority falling in the middle categories. In really

taking care of the problem, the distribution of responses was similar, with 10 percent very favorable and 16 percent very critical. But in evaluating the consideration shown by agencies and respect to fair treatment, respondents were slightly more positive than negative. There was a slight difference with more favorable than unfavorable responses on being careful to avoid errors, and a similar but slight significant differential on correcting errors.

In summary, government offices got very good marks from between 10 percent and 19 percent of respondents, with the majority of respondents falling into the middle three categories. The two most negative categories never total more than 18 percent of the people. Perhaps a fair summary of people's views of government service offices is that agencies are mediocre in their treatment of clients.

Tables 4 & 5 about here

Table 5 records responses to the same six aspects of treatment, but this time government offices are compared with business organizations. In response to the question, "How do you think most government offices compare with most business organizations, I mean private enterprise, on these same points?", the modal response for all except fairness of treatment was that business fares better. When government organizations are compared to businesses on a number of aspects of treatment, government offices score a distant second. The area in which government bureaucracies fare worst is in giving prompt service. A full 54 percent of respondents consider business better at giving prompt service in comparison to 7 percent who think government bureaucracies give prompter service. Taken together,

Tables 4 and 5 show that in general, Americans rate government offices in a way which is generally consistent with negative stereotypes of bureaucracy, namely, bureaucracies are ponderous, inconsiderate, slow in correcting mistakes, and inadequate in really taking care of problems.

Relationship between Specific Evaluation and General Evaluation

Thus far, data have been presented in support of the contentions that a) people rate their own contacts with government service bureaucracies in a favorable manner while b) holding negative stereotypes about government bureaucracy. Several explanations for this paradox are reasonable. One possibility is that individuals who hold the most negative stereotypes are those who have not had contact with government bureaucracies. Forty-two percent of the 1973 bureaucratic encounters sample did not have contact with any of the seven service agencies under study. Perhaps these individuals hold more negative attitudes about bureaucracy than those who have utilized services and it is, therefore, these non-users who are responsible for the continuation of the negative stereotypes.

Tables 6 & 7 about here

To test this, one can compare columns 5 and 7 of Table 6 showing the ratings on considerate treatment of government offices in general (taken from Table 4) for those respondents who had contact with one or more of the seven service agencies and the total sample. What is most impressive about the two columns is their remarkable similarity to each other. Those respondents who use government services rate government bureaucracies very much the same as the total sample. In

fact, a comparison of columns 5 and 6 shows that those with no experience with government agencies are slightly more favorable than those with personal experience in their rating of considerate treatment by government agencies in general. Table 7 presents similar data for ratings of promptness of service. Likewise, rather than discount uncomplimentary stereotypes, those with experience are slightly more negative, and thus more supportive of the stereotype, than are those respondents with no experience (column 6) with the seven government services.

Tables 8 and 9 present further evidence that using a government agency does nothing to upgrade the client's image of government bureaucracy. The dependent variable in Table 8 is an index constructed from the six aspects of treatment shown in Table 4 (coefficient alpha = .90). The independent variables are problem area and use/non-use of the seven government services. According to the questionnaire schedule, respondents first indicated whether they had a problem in a particular area, e.g., finding a job, and then indicated whether they had sought help from a government agency. Both Tables 8 and 9 look only at those individuals who admitted having a problem in a service area and compare the favorableness of attitudes toward government bureaucracies for users of the service with non-users. An examination of the first row of each table, which contains respondents who are most negative in their attitudes toward government bureaucracy, shows that in general the users of the service are more likely to show negative attitudes than non-users who expressed a need in the area. A conspicuous exception in both tables are the recipients of social security. In the case of social security, both clients and non-clients are quite favorable in their attitudes toward government bureaucracy, with the clients being slightly more

positive.[1] While Table 8 has as its dependent variable an index of general attitudes toward government bureaucracy, Table 9 has an index of items comparing

Tables 8 & 9 about here

government organizations with business organizations. The items come from Table 5 (coefficient alpha = .82), and the results are similar to those reported in Table 8. However, the difference in attitude between clients and needy non-clients is more pronounced at the positive end of the scale for employment service, job training, worker's compensation, and unemployment compensation. The non-users were more likely than the users to rate government over business in treatment of clients in these four service areas.

The evidence in Tables 6 through 9 suggests that the negative responses which people give to evaluation of government bureaucracy were not made by those individuals who are not clients of one or more government agencies. The same clients of government agencies who express fairly high levels of satisfaction with their own encounters with government bureaucracy also express fairly negative attitudes toward government bureaucracy in the abstract. And those individuals who do not become clients of government organizations are somewhat less likely to accept stereotypes of government organizations. The literature on stereotypes suggests that close contact should reduce stereotypes (Deutsch and Collins, 1951), unless, of course, those contacts reinforce the stereotype. How-

[1] A consistent finding of the bureaucratic encounters study is the fact that older people report higher levels of satisfaction with their own experience as well as more positive attitudes toward government bureaucracies. (Katz et al, 1975) The favorable response to Social Security is, in part, attributable to the age of the clients, but is also a function of the agency characteristics. (Gutek, 1975)

ever, as reported above, clients respond positively to their own encounters with government agencies. Can clients respond positively to the encounter and still feel that aspects of the encounter confirm negative stereotypes? A closer look at responses of clients is warranted.

Tables 6 and 7 contain information about the relationship between aspects of client's evaluation of his own experience and ratings of government agencies in general. Table 6 shows that compared with clients who said the agency representative expended no effort ($\bar{x}$ = 2.8), those clients who felt the agency representative expended more effort than was necessary were more likely to rate government organizations in general high in considerate treatment ($\bar{x}$ = 4.24). There is, then, some relationship between evaluation of own experience and general ratings. A closer look at the Table suggests, however, that the relationship is present predominantly for those clients who responded negatively to their own contact with government agency. Clients who suggested that more effort than necessary was expended were remarkably like those respondents who had no experience with an agency ($\bar{x}$ = 4.24 vs. $\bar{x}$ = 4.28). Both of these groups showed distributions on general ratings of considerate treatment which were slightly positively skewed. They contrast sharply with those clients who said their agency representative showed no effort at all ($\bar{x}$ = 2.8) or less effort than necessary ($\bar{x}$ = 3.6). These clients are negatively skewed in their distribution of scores on general ratings of considerate treatment. Table 7 tells a similar story, although here those clients treated very efficiently ($\bar{x}$ = 4.1) are somewhat more likely than individuals with no experience ($\bar{x}$ = 3.9) to report that government bureaucracies provide prompt service. However, as in the case of considerate treatment, the clients who are dissatisfied with their treatment show a greater

generalization to ratings of government bureaucracy in general. (Clients who rate their own experience very inefficient have a mean score of 2.8 on general ratings of promptness of service.) The experiences of clients with government bureaucracy generalize to their attitudes toward bureaucracy in general if they have a negative experience but not if they have a positive experience.

DISCUSSION

Individuals who use government service agencies are relatively satisfied with their encounters with those agencies. Clients claim that in general they are satisfied with the outcome, feel that the agency representative expends the necessary effort to process their case, feel that the agency is efficient and that they are treated fairly. In sum, clients of government bureaucracy are satisfied with their treatment in the receipt of service. However, these same clients who are satisfied with own encounters may be negative in their evaluations of government organizations in general. As long as clients have some particular agency as a referent, they tend to report that agency in fairly positive terms. Government agencies in general, however, are perceived less positively.

A plausible explanation which was advanced suggests that the negative stereotypes may not be attributed to human service clients, but rather are made by those persons who do not contact government agencies, who only "know" government bureaucracy indirectly through reports from the media or second-hand reports of friends and relatives. In any event, individuals who have not received a service from a government bureaucracy might be expected to be more negative in attitude than the client who has received a significant service such as unemployment compensation, welfare, or retirement benefits. However plausible the explanation may seem, the data do not support it. Non-clients are at least as positive

as clients in their evaluation of characteristics of government bureaucracy.

An examination of the relationship between evaluation of aspects of their own experience and evaluation of government offices in general showed that the dissatisfied clients were the most responsible for the negative evaluation of all clients. Satisfied clients may not attribute their satisfaction to the agency. Perhaps they feel that they were responsible for successfully negotiating a difficult encounter. Perhaps they feel they deserve prompt, courteous attention by an efficient representative. On the other hand, dissatisfied clients may be more likely to attribute their negative experiences directly to the agency. Furthermore, their perceptions of the service agency carry over to their perceptions of government offices in general. An interpretation of the above data which is consistent with attribution theory suggests that success with an agency (high levels of satisfaction) is attributed to characteristics of the client (e.g., resourcefulness, persistance) but failure with an agency (low levels of satisfaction) is attributable to characteristics of the agency (e.g., slowness of service, inefficiency) (Weiner, Frieze, Kukla, Reed, Rest, and Rosenbaum, 1972). Satisfied clients would not generalize from their experience to government agencies in general because they feel responsible for their success. Dissatisfied clients, on the other hand, would generalize from their experience to government agencies in general because they attribute their lack of success to agency characteristics.

The present findings are relevant to several issues surrounding the use of client reactions as feedback on organizational effectiveness.

One classic problem with the use of client satisfaction as an assessment of organizational functioning is determining what is a satisfactory level

of satisfaction! If 50 percent of the clients of an agency are satisfied, should the agency feel proud or embarrassed? The bureaucratic encounters study reports relatively high levels of satisfaction -- 68 percent of clients of seven different service organizations reported that they were either very or fairly well satisfied with the way their problem was handled by the agency. The present paper suggests, however, that 68 percent leaves something to be desired, especially in light of the fact that one unexpected consequence of client dissatisfaction is a lowered evaluation of government agencies in general.

Another problem in the use of client satisfaction as an assessment of organizational functioning is determining what clients mean when they report high levels of satisfaction. The present paper suggests that satisfaction has a different meaning than dissatisfaction. A satisfied client is one who says that things are O. K., that nothing is noticeably absent. A satisfied client is probably able, however, to suggest improvements in the service delivery system. In sum, satisfaction is hardly synonomous with perfection. A dissatisfied client, on the other hand, is one who has definite complaints about aspects of agency functioning. Dissatisfaction may thus be more important than satisfaction. Perhaps it is not unreasonable for an agency to strive for a 100 percent rate of satisfaction from its clients, or given an imperfect world, a 90-95 percent satisfaction rate.

Discussing limitations of the concept of satisfaction does not imply that satisfaction as a measure of organizational functioning should be abandoned. Subjective measures of organizational effectiveness are important either alone or in conjunction with objective measures of effectiveness. We all live in a subjective world. In fact, one can argue that if clients are satisfied, what

more should be done? The usefulness and importance of satisfaction and related measures should not, however, obscure the problems with the concept. The satisfied client can still have fairly negative attitudes toward government bureaucracy in general. More importantly, the dissatisfied client is fairly certain to be negative in his evaluation of public bureaucracy. Dissatisfied clients may be in the minority, but they are important because their negativity inevitably carries over to their general evaluations of government bureaucracy. The present study did not include data on activism, but it would be interesting to see whether the dissatisfied client becomes politically active in response to his negativity. More studies which look at both attitudinal and behavioral long-range consequences of client satisfaction are needed. In that way more knowledge will be gained about the subjective meaning of satisfaction and of its ultimate utility as an indicator of organizational effectiveness in human service agencies.

Table 1

Correlations among Aspects of the Evaluation of the Bureaucratic Encounter*

	A	B	C	D
A. Perceived effort of official	-	.72	.67	.61
B. Client satisfied with service		-	.83	.72
C. Agency is efficient			-	.67
D. Client treated fairly				-

*Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients are reported. All correlations are significant at $p < .001$.

Table 2

How satisfied were you with the way the office handled your problem?

Rating	Type of Problem								
	Finding job	Job training	Workmen's Compensation	Unemployment Compensation	Welfare	Hospital/ Medical	Retirement	Other	Total
Very satisfied	35.1%	50.9%	52.5%	35.2%	27.2%	48.9%	64.2%	41.9%	42.6%
Fairly well satisfied	26.3	22.6	22.5	35.8	34.0	8.9	23.7	14.5	25.9
Somewhat dissatisfied	15.8	18.9	5.0	13.6	18.4	24.4	3.5	11.3	12.6
Very dissatisfied	19.9	5.7	10.0	11.7	9.7	17.8	2.9	29.0	13.5
D. K.	0	0	0	.1	0	0	.6	1.6	0
N. A.	2.9	1.9	10.0	3.1	1.9	0	4.6	1.6	5.1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	(171)	(53)	(40)	(162)	(103)	(45)	(173)	(62)	(827)

Table 3

Do you feel you were treated fairly, or unfairly, by the office?

Rating	Type of Problem								
	Finding job	Job training	Workmen's Compensation	Unemployment Compensation	Welfare	Hospital/ Medical	Retirement	Other	Total
Fairly	75.4%	84.9%	85.0%	81.5%	67.0%	64.4%	87.3%	58.1%	75.9%
Mixed	7.6	1.9	2.5	6.2	5.8	4.4	2.3	1.6	4.6
Unfairly	11.7	7.5	5.0	7.4	23.3	28.9	4.6	30.6	12.5
D. K.	2.3	3.8	0	0	0	0	1.2	8.1	2.2
N. A.	2.9	1.9	7.5	3.1	1.9	2.2	4.0	1.6	4.8
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	(171)	(53)	(40)	(162)	(103)	(45)	(173)	(62)	(827)

Table 4

Ratings of Government Offices on Various Criteria

Rating	Giving prompt service	Really taking care of problem	Considerate treatment	Fair Treatment	Avoiding Mistakes	Correcting Mistakes
1. Very bad	8.0%	6.4%	5.3%	5.1%	6.5%	6.9%
2.	10.1	9.9	7.3	7.1	9.6	10.0
3.	19.0	18.7	15.4	13.8	17.2	15.3
4.	30.5	32.0	29.1	28.1	26.1	24.3
5.	19.1	18.7	24.2	25.2	20.2	19.2
6.	6.4	7.7	10.7	12.4	12.3	13.5
7. Excellent	3.9	3.0	4.2	4.7	4.3	5.8
D.K.	3.1	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.9	5.0
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
N	(1422)	(1419)	(1419)	(1418)	(1420)	(1414)

Table 5

Comparison of Ratings of Government and Business Organizations

Rating	Giving prompt service	Really taking care of problem	Considerate treatment	Fair treatment	Avoiding mistakes	Correcting mistakes
Government better	7.0%	11.5%	11.5%	18.8%	14.6%	14.3%
Both the same	36.0	39.0	37.6	44.5	36.8	35.9
Business better	54.4	45.9	47.9	33.7	45.0	45.9
D. K.	2.6	3.6	3.0	3.0	3.6	3.9
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	(1391)	(1415)	(1418)	(1413)	(1411)	(1372)

Table 6

Own Experience with Service Agency Helpfulness Related to General Ratings of Considerate Treatment by Public Agencies

General Ratings of Considerate Treatment		Amount of Effort						
		More effort	About right	Less effort	No effort	Total with experience	No experience with agency	Total sample
Very bad	1	4.0%	4.0%	9.9%	26.1%	6.9%	3.8%	5.3%
	2	10.3	5.4	10.9	21.7	8.5	6.1	7.3
	3	15.1	17.4	20.8	15.9	17.3	13.3	15.4
	4	27.0	29.5	35.6	24.6	29.4	31.8	29.1
	5	22.2	25.2	17.8	7.2	22.0	29.3	24.2
	6	15.1	13.2	3.0	4.3	11.3	11.1	10.7
Excellent	7	6.3	5.4	2.0	0	4.6	4.5	4.2
D. K.								3.8
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
N		(126)	(448)	(101)	(69)	(744)	(576)	(1320)

Table 7

Own Experience with Service Agency Efficiency Related to General Ratings of Promptness of Service of Public Agencies

General ratings of promptness of service		Own Experience: Very efficient	Fairly efficient	Rather inefficient	Very inefficient	Total experience	Total no experience	Total sample
Very bad	1	6.7%	8.8%	22.7%	22.1%	10.8%	4.8%	8.0%
	2	7.3	12.4	9.3	19.8	10.6	9.9	10.1
	3	19.6	17.7	22.7	24.4	19.8	19.2	19.0
	4	24.9	34.1	29.3	25.6	28.5	35.8	30.5
	5	26.0	18.1	9.0	8.1	19.5	19.6	19.1
	6	7.9	5.2	4.0	0	5.7	7.5	6.4
Excellent	7	7.6	3.6	4.0	0	5.1	3.2	3.9
D. K.								3.1
Total		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N		(342)	(249)	(75)	(86)	(752)	(577)	(1422)

Table 8

General Attitudes toward Government for Recipients and Needy Non-recipients of Seven Government Services

Attitudes		Employment		Job Training		Work Comp.		Unemploy.		Welfare		Hospital		Soc. Sec.	
		Use	Don't	Use	Don't	Use	Don't	Use	Don't	Use	Don't	Use	Don't	Use	Don't
Low	1	18.0%	11.9%	23.8%	12.4%	16.7%	13.3%	15.4%	9.1%	20.0%	--	22.9%	18.2%	6.2%	7.4%
	2	14.4	9.7	12.7	14.0	13.0	14.7	14.0	4.5	12.7	--	16.9	27.3	6.2	5.6
	3	20.1	22.4	23.0	21.4	19.4	20.0	19.4	27.3	18.2	--	16.9	18.2	15.9	11.1
	4	17.7	17.2	15.1	19.1	14.8	17.3	19.4	31.8	12.7	--	13.3	22.7	21.0	29.6
	5	12.3	17.2	10.3	13.7	13.0	17.3	12.9	13.6	10.3	--	8.4	9.1	16.9	13.0
	6	12.0	15.7	9.5	13.7	16.7	12.0	13.8	4.5	18.8	--	10.8	4.5	17.4	20.4
High	7	5.4	6.0	5.6	5.7	6.5	5.3	5.1	9.1	7.3	--	10.8	0.0	16.4	13.0
N		(333)	(134)	(126)	(299)	(108)	(75)	(356)	(22)	(165)	(3)	(83)	(22)	(195)	(54)

Table 9

Public vs. Private Preference for Recipients and Needy Non-recipients of Seven Government Services

Public Preference		Employment		Job Training		Work Comp.		Unemploy.		Welfare		Hospital		Soc. Sec.	
		Use	Didn't	Use	Didn't	Use	Didn't	Use	Didn't	Use	Didn't	Use	Didn't	Use	Didn't
Low	1	19.9%	17.2%	19.7%	14.8%	17.6%	18.7%	21.7%	9.1%	15.2%	--	19.5%	10.0%	14.0%	20.0%
	2	9.2	12.7	8.7	11.1	14.8	5.3	9.2	13.6	9.1	--	6.1	25.0	8.3	12.7
	3	13.4	4.5	18.1	8.8	9.3	9.3	10.6	13.6	8.5	--	4.9	5.0	5.7	7.3
	4	21.1	23.1	15.7	22.9	21.3	21.3	21.4	18.2	11.5	--	12.2	30.0	15.0	14.5
	5	14.0	13.4	17.3	16.5	17.6	12.0	12.8	4.5	17.6	--	14.6	10.0	18.7	14.5
	6	12.5	14.9	12.6	14.1	13.9	16.0	15.8	27.3	24.2	--	22.0	10.0	24.9	20.0
High	7	9.8	14.2	7.9	11.8	5.6	17.3	8.6	13.6	13.9	--	20.7	10.0	13.5	10.9
N		(336)	(134)	(127)	(297)	(108)	(75)	(360)	(22)	(165)	(3)	(82)	(20)	(193)	(55)

References

Campbell, A., Converse, P., & Rodgers, W. The Perceived Quality of Life. New York: Russell Sage, 1976.

Deutsch, M., & Collins, M. E. Interracial Housing: A Psychological Evaluation of a Social Experiment. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1951.

Gerth, H. H., & Mills, C. W. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Gutek, B. A. Social system and psychological contexts of support for the political system. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1975.

Katz, D., Gutek, B. A., Kahn, R. L., & Barton, E. Bureaucratic Encounters: A Pilot Study in the Evaluation of Government Service. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1975.

Miller, A. H. Political issues and trust in government: 1964-1970. Paper presented at 1972 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington D.C., 1972.

Miller, A. H., Brown, T. A., & Raine, S. Social conflict and political estrangement, 1958-1972. Paper presented at the 1973 Midwest Political Science Association, 1973.

Moch, M. Quality of Service Measurement Program and Instrumentation. Social Security Administration Contract No. 600-75-0141, November 24, 1975.

Tripodi, T., Fellin, P., & Epstein, I. Social Program Evaluation. Itasca: F. E. Peacock Publishing, Inc., 1971.

Weiner, B., Frieze, I., Kulka, A., Reed, L., Rest, S., & Rosenbaum, R. M. Perceiving the causes of success and failure. In E. E. Jones, et al. (Eds.), Attribution: Perceiving the Causes of Behavior. Moorstown: General Learning Press, 1972.

Withey, S., & Andrews, F. Social Indicators of Well-being. New York: Plenum Publishing Company, in press.

mm
4.8.76